

Appl. No. 10/612,254  
 Amdt. Dated August 30, 2005  
 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

### ...REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS...


The present Supplemental Amendment presents the same claim amendments that were presented in applicant's Supplemental Amendment After filed July 26, 2005, which the Examiner indicated would be allowed

In the Advisory Action mailed August 11, 2005 Examiner stated:

The amendment filed on July 26, 2005 further clarifies the rotational movement of the guide plates, but the previous rejection is affirmed as this does not materially change the invention as previously claimed.

The claims remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 3,648,867 to Beavers.


What the Examiner construes as "upper plates 26, 23" and "lower plates 24, 22" in Beavers are shown in Figs. 1 and 2 as follows:



-8-

-8-

Appl. No. 10/612,254  
Amdt. Dated August 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005



As can be readily seen from Figs. 1 and 2, elements 22, 23, 24 and 26 are all **tubular or cylindrical shaped** structures that are concentric.

Applicant's independent claims require "upper and lower opposed **planar** guide plates."

The **tubular or cylindrical shaped** structural elements 22, 23, 24 and 26 of Beavers are not "planar plates."

Therefore, Beavers clearly fails to meet the recitation in applicant's independent claims 1 and 9 of "upper and lower opposed **planar** guide plates."

Noting the Examiner's reliance upon dictionary definitions, applicant notes that the definition (www.websters.com) for "planar" is:

1 : of, relating to, or lying in a plane

2 : two-dimensional in quality

Appl. No. 10/612,254  
Amdt. Dated August 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

It is clear that, Beavers does not teach or in any way anticipate applicant's claimed invention and the outstanding rejection of the claims as being anticipated by Beavers should properly be withdrawn.

Based upon the above distinctions between the prior art relied upon by the Examiner and the present invention, and the overall teachings of prior art, properly considered as a whole, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner cannot rely upon the prior art as required under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipating applicant's claimed invention.

It is, therefore, submitted that any reliance upon prior art would be improper inasmuch as the prior art does not remotely anticipate, teach, suggest or render obvious the present invention.

It is submitted that the claims, as now amended, and the discussion contained herein clearly show that the claimed invention is novel and neither anticipated nor obvious over the teachings of the prior art and the outstanding rejection of the claims should hence be withdrawn.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of the claims and an early allowance of the claims is believed to be in order.


It is believed that the above represents a complete response to the Official Action and reconsideration is requested.

If upon consideration of the above, the Examiner should feel that there remain outstanding issues in the present application that could be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's patent counsel at the telephone number given below to discuss such issues.

Appl. No. 10/612,254  
Amdt. Dated August 30, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 12-2136 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael S. Gzybowski  
Reg. No. 32,816

BUTZEL LONG  
350 South Main Street  
Suite 300  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104  
(734) 995-3110

134256.1